arXiv:1607.06067v3 [math.OC] 10 Apr 2017

Tauberian theorem for value functions*

Dmitry Khlopin

khlopin@imm.uran.ru

April 12, 2017

Abstract

For two-person dynamic zero-sum games (both discrete and continuous settings), we investigate the limit of value functions of finite horizon games with long run average cost as the time horizon tends to infinity and the limit of value functions of λ-discounted games as the discount tends to zero. We prove that the Dynamic Programming Principle for value functions directly leads to the Tauberian Theorem—that the existence of a uniform limit of the value functions for one of the families implies that the other one also uniformly converges to the same limit. No assumptions on strategies are necessary. To this end, we consider a mapping that takes each payoff to the corresponding value function and preserves the sub- and super- optimality principles (the Dynamic Programming Principle). With their aid, we obtain certain inequalities on asymptotics of sub- and super- solutions, which lead to the Tauberian Theorem. In particular, we consider the case of differential games without relying on the existence of the saddle point; a very simple stochastic game model is also considered.

Keywords: Dynamic programming principle, Abel mean, Cesaro mean, differential games, zero-sum games

MSC2010 91A25, 49L20, 49N70, 91A23, 40E05

1 Introduction

Hardy proved (see, for example, [23, Sect. 6.8]) that, for a bounded continuous function g, the limit of long run averages and the limit of discounted averages (Cesaro mean and Abel mean,

*Krasovskii Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 16, S.Kovalevskaja St., 620990, Yekaterinburg, Russia; Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science, Ural Federal University, 4, Turgeneva St., 620083, Yekaterinburg, Russia

respectively)

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(t)\,dt, \qquad \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}g(t)\,dt$$

coincide if there exists at least one of these limits. This result and its generalizations have many applications (see, for example, [8, 18, 29]).

Let us consider the analogs of this Tauberian theorem for asymptotics of optimal values in game-theoretic problem statements. What if we optimize the Abel mean and/or Cesaro mean and then consider the limit of the optimal values corresponding to them? Such a limit value (as the discount tends to zero) was first considered in [9] for a stochastic formulation. As proved in [7], for a stochastic two-person game with a finite number of states and actions, optimal long-time averages and optimal discounted averages share the common limit. For more details on the limit value for Abel mean and/or Cesaro mean in other stochastic formulations, see [24, 32, 35, 42, 46, 48, 50].

In the deterministic case, the question of existence of limit values arose in the control theory, time and again; one may at the very least note [12, 14, 20]. In the ergodic case (more generally, in the nonexpansive-like case) such limits exist and, moreover, they are usually independent of the initial state, which was demonstrated in [3, 6, 17]; although the results were released roughly at the same time, the methods of obtaining them were thoroughly different. For the latest results on existence of limits of such values (for the nonexpansive-like case), see also [10, Sect. 3.4],[11, 21, 34, 41].

A Tauberian theorem (the equality of limit values) was proved for discrete time systems in [33]. The same result was obtained under an additional assumption that one of those limits is a constant function for control problems [2] and for differential games [1]. Note that, even in simple cases of control problems, the limits may not be constant functions [22, 41]. In the general (non-ergodic) case, a Tauberian theorem for very general dynamic systems was first proved in paper [40]. Then, in [26], a Tauberian theorem was proposed for differential games (under Isaacs's condition). Later, in [49], a very general approach to proving Tauberian theorems was proposed for games with two players with opposite goals in discrete setting. In particular, it implies the same result for recursive games [35]. Note that, in addition to uniform and exponential payoff families, the Tauberian theorems can be formulated for arbitrary probability densities. The corresponding results are known for discrete time systems [38, 43] and for optimal control and games [27, 34, 50].

The cornerstone of papers [26, 40] is the construction of near-optimal strategies for one of the averages by pieces of near-optimal strategies for another average. It requires some assumptions on players' strategies, in particular, the Dynamic Programming Principle; in addition, for games, there must be the existence of saddle point (see [26, 27], and unpublished work [25]). Paper [49] exhibits a more subtle approach. In stochastic games, the value is a fixed point of

the Shapley operator for the corresponding game. Parameterized (by the discount or the finite horizon) families of the corresponding Shapley operators were embedded into certain Lipschitz continuous families of nonexpansive operators, and the corresponding Tauberian theorem was proved for the fixed points of the latter operators.

The main aim of this paper is to obtain the Tauberian theorem as a direct consequence of the Dynamic Programming Principle without any technical assumptions on strategies, payoff functions, or anything else. To this end, we introduce a mapping (called a game value map) that assigns to every payoff the corresponding value function. In the general case, this map can be constructed only by payoff functions corresponding to the Abel mean and Cesaro mean as payoffs, no strategies required. Considering a properly chosen chain of payoffs, using the monotonicity of the game value map and sub- and super- optimality principles, we obtain one-sided inequalities on asymptotics leading to all Tauberian theorems. Since no additional assumptions are imposed on the players' strategies (compare with [26, 25]), neither topological nor measurable structures are used (compare with [50]) to prove the Tauberian theorem itself, not even the existence of saddle point (as in [26, 27, 49]) is required, although a reduction to the typical formalization will apparently require some of these.

We also apply this general theorem to zero-sum dynamic games in continuous and discrete settings and to differential games without a saddle point.

The structure of the paper is as follows. We start by formulating the Tauberian theorem for dynamic games in continuous setting (Theorem 1) in Sect. 2. Then, we consider the general statement: we define the concept of a game value map and formulate the Tauberian theorem for this map (Theorem 2) and the one-side inequalities on asymptotics (Propositions 1–4). Sect. 4 contains the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. Sections 5 and 6 are devoted to the Tauberian theorem for games in discrete setting (Theorem 3) and for differential games (Theorem 4), respectively. Also, the Tauberian theorem for a very simple stochastic game model (Corollary 2) is shown in Sect. 5. The unwieldy and cumbersome proofs of propositions are confined to Appendix.

2 A dynamic zero-sum game

Dynamic system. Set $\mathbb{R}_+ \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Assume the following items are given:

- a nonempty set Ω, the state space;
- a nonempty set $\mathbb{K}$ of maps from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to Ω;
- a running cost $g : \Omega \mapsto [0, 1]$; for each process $z \in \mathbb{K}$, the map $t \mapsto g(z(t))$ is assumed to be Borel measurable.

On payoffs. Let us now define a time average $v_T(z)$ and a discount average $w_\lambda(z)$ for each process $z \in \mathbb{K}$ by the following rules:

$$v_T(z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(z(t))\,dt, \quad w_\lambda(z) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt \qquad \forall T, \lambda > 0, z \in \mathbb{K}.$$

Note that the definitions are valid, and the means lie within $[0,1]$.

On lower games. For all $\omega \in \Omega$, let there be given non-empty sets $\mathcal{L}(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\omega)$. Let, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, each pair $(l,m) \in \mathcal{L}(\omega) \times \mathcal{M}(\omega)$ of players' rules generate a unique process $z[\omega,l,m] \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $z[\omega,l,m](0) = \omega$.

The lower game is conducted in the following way: for a given $\omega \in \Omega$, the first player shows $l \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)$, and then, the second player chooses $m \in \mathcal{M}(\omega)$. The value function of this game is

$$\mathbb{V}[c](\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\omega)} c(z[\omega,l,m]) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{1}$$

For instance, for every $T, \lambda > 0$, the payoffs v_T, w_λ generate the following value functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_T(\omega) &\stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{V}[v_T](\omega) = \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\omega)} \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(z[\omega,l,m](t))\,dt \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega,\\
\mathcal{W}_\lambda(\omega) &\stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{V}[w_\lambda](\omega) = \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\omega)} \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z[\omega,l,m](t))\,dt \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us say that the payoff family $v_T (T > 0)$ enjoys *the Dynamic Programming Principle* iff, for all $T > 0$, the value function $\mathcal{V}_T$ coincides with the value functions for the following payoffs:

$$\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto \frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T-h}{T}\mathcal{V}_{T-h}(z(h)) \quad \forall h \in (0,T).$$

Let us say that the payoff family $w_\lambda (\lambda > 0)$ enjoys *the Dynamic Programming Principle* iff, for all $\lambda > 0$, the value function $\mathcal{W}_\lambda$ coincides with the value functions for the following payoffs:

$$\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto \lambda\int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt + e^{-\lambda h}\mathcal{W}_\lambda(z(h)) \quad \forall h > 0.$$

Theorem 1 *Assume that the payoff families $v_T(T > 0)$ and $w_\lambda(\lambda > 0)$ enjoy the Dynamic Programming Principle.*

Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

($\imath$) *The family of functions $\mathcal{V}_T$ $(T > 0)$ converges uniformly on Ω as $T \uparrow \infty$.*

($\imath\imath$) *The family of functions $\mathcal{W}_\lambda$ $(\lambda > 0)$ converges uniformly on Ω as $\lambda \downarrow 0$.*

Moreover, when at least one of these statements holds, we have

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \mathcal{V}_T(\omega) = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \mathcal{W}_\lambda(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

For the proof of this theorem, refer to Sect. 4.

On abstract control systems. We can obtain the Tauberian theorem for an abstract control system. Following [40], assume the sets Ω, $\mathbb{K}$ to be given; for all $\omega \in \Omega$, let $\mathcal{L}(\omega)$ be the set of all feasible processes $z \in \mathbb{K}$ that begin at ω. Let $\mathcal{M}(\omega)$ be a singleton for all $\omega \in \Omega$.

Now, Theorem 1 implies

Corollary 1 *Assume that the payoff families $v_T(T > 0)$ and $w_\lambda(\lambda > 0)$ enjoy the Dynamic Programming Principle.*

Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

($\imath$) *The maps $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \sup_{z \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)} v_T(z)$ converge uniformly on Ω as $T \uparrow \infty$.*

($\imath\imath$) *The maps $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \sup_{z \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)} w_\lambda(z)$ converge uniformly on Ω as $\lambda \downarrow 0$.*

Moreover, when at least one of these statements holds, we have

$$\lim_{T \uparrow \infty} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)} v_T(z) = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)} w_\lambda(z) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

In [40], it is stated that the Tauberian theorem holds for an abstract control system if $\mathbb{K}$ is closed with respect to concatenation. This condition can be refined, see [28].

Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 look similar to Tauberian theorems for dynamic zero-sum game and control system with continuous setting, respectively, in the most general statement. Nevertheless, let us sketch the examples when this similarity is misleading. In certain game problems with information discrimination, the second player has to choose m from $\mathcal{M}(\omega, l)$ instead of from $\mathcal{M}(\omega)$ [13]. Value functions with $\inf_l \sup_m \inf_\tau$ instead of $\sup_l \inf_m$ are applied in Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs variational inequalities [47, (17.7)] and pursuit-evasion-defense problems [19, (12)]. Finally, for instance, for the control problem, a maximization of the expectation of the payoff with respect to some probability distribution (see, for instance, [39, (11.3.2)], [31, (2.5)]) is not covered by Corollary 1. For this reason, in the next section, we introduce a mapping (called a game value map) that assigns to each payoff the corresponding value function, and then we formulate the Tauberian theorem for game value map.

3 General statement.

On game value map. Let the sets Ω and $\mathbb{K}$, running cost g, and payoffs v_T, w_λ be as before. Denote by $\mathfrak{U}$ the set of all bounded maps from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$; denote by $\mathfrak{C}$ a non-empty set

of maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Thereinafter, the set $\mathfrak{C}$ incorporates all conceivable payoffs, and the set $\mathfrak{U}$ contains all value functions for all games with payoffs $c \in \mathfrak{C}$.

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ satisfy the following condition:

$$Ac + B \in \mathfrak{C} \text{ for all } A \geq 0, B \in \mathbb{R} \text{ if } c \in \mathfrak{C}. \tag{2a}$$

In this section, we also assume that $v_T, w_\lambda \in \mathfrak{C}$ for all positive λ, T.

A map V from $\mathfrak{C}$ to $\mathfrak{U}$ is called *a game value map* if the following conditions hold:

$$V[Ac + B] = A\,V[c] + B \text{ for all } c \in \mathfrak{C}, A \geq 0, B \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2b}$$

$$V[c_1](\omega) \leq V[c_2](\omega) \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega \text{ if } c_1(z) \leq c_2(z) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{K}. \tag{2c}$$

On Dynamic Programming Principle. For all positive $\lambda, T, h > 0$ and every function $U_* : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, define payoffs $\zeta^{U_*}_{h,T} : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\xi^{U_*}_{h,\lambda} : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta^{U_*}_{h,T}(z) &\triangleq \frac{1}{T+h}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T}{T+h}U_*(z(h)) \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K};\\
\xi^{U_*}_{h,\lambda}(z) &\triangleq \lambda\int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt + e^{-\lambda h}U_*(z(h)) \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}.
\end{aligned}$$

Definition 1 *For a game value map V, let us say that a family of $U_T \in \mathfrak{U}(T > 0)$ is a subsolution $\big($a supersolution$\big)$ for the family of payoffs $v_T(T > 0)$ if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists natural $\bar{T}$ such that, for all natural $h, T > \bar{T}$, the payoff $\zeta^{U_T}_{h,T}$ lies in $\mathfrak{C}$ and enjoys*

$$U_{T+h} \leq V[\zeta^{U_T}_{h,T}] + \varepsilon \quad \Big(U_{T+h} \geq V[\zeta^{U_T}_{h,T}] - \varepsilon\Big).$$

For a game value map V, let us say that a family of $U_\lambda \in \mathfrak{U}(\lambda > 0)$ is a subsolution $\big($a supersolution$\big)$ for the family of payoffs $w_\lambda(\lambda > 0)$ if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists natural $\bar{T}$ such that, for all natural $h > \bar{T}$ and positive $\lambda < 1/\bar{T}$, the payoff $\xi^{U_\lambda}_{h,\lambda} \in \mathfrak{C}$ lies in $\mathfrak{C}$ and enjoys

$$U_\lambda \leq V[\xi^{U_\lambda}_{h,\lambda}] + \varepsilon \quad \Big(U_\lambda \geq V[\xi^{U_\lambda}_{h,\lambda}] - \varepsilon\Big).$$

For similar definitions, refer to the suboptimality principle [5, Definition III.2.31] (also referred to as 'stability with respect to second player' [30]) and [5, Sect. VI.4] for discrete setting.

Definition 2 *For a game value map V, let us say that the family of payoffs $v_T(T > 0)$ (resp., $w_\lambda(\lambda > 0)$) enjoys the weak Dynamic Programming Principle iff their value functions ($V[v_T]$ and, resp., $V[w_\lambda]$) are, at the same time, a subsolution and a supersolution for this payoff family.*

In particular, the family of payoffs $v_T(T > 0)$ (resp., $w_\lambda(\lambda > 0)$) enjoys the weak Dynamic Programming Principle if

$$V[v_{T+h}] = V[\zeta^{V[v_T]}_{h,T}], \quad \Big(V[w_\lambda] = V[\xi^{V[w_\lambda]}_{h,\lambda}]\Big) \qquad \forall h, T \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda > 0.$$

Theorem 2 *Let there be given a game value map* $V : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$. *Let* $v_T, w_\lambda \in \mathfrak{C}$ *for all* $\lambda, T > 0$. *Assume that payoffs* $v_T (T > 0)$ *and payoffs* $w_\lambda (\lambda > 0)$ *enjoy the weak Dynamic Programming Principle.*

Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

($\imath$) *The family of functions* $V[v_T]$ $(T > 0)$ *converges uniformly on* Ω *as* $T \uparrow \infty$.

($\imath\imath$) *The family of functions* $V[w_\lambda]$ $(\lambda > 0)$ *converges uniformly on* Ω *as* $\lambda \downarrow 0$.

Moreover, when at least one of these statements holds, we have

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} V[v_T](\omega) = \lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} V[w_\lambda](\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

This theorem generalizes Theorem 1. For its proof, refer to Sect. 4.

One-sided Tauberian theorems for bounds from above. In Appendix B, we prove the following proposition:

Proposition 1 *For a game value map* V , *let a family of functions* $U_T \in \mathfrak{U} (T > 0)$ *and the family of functions* $V[w_\lambda](\lambda > 0)$ *be a subsolution for payoffs* v_T *and a supersolution for payoffs* w_λ , *respectively.*

Further, let $U_T (T > 0)$ *satisfy*

$$\limsup_{T\uparrow\infty} \sup_{p\in[1,p_0]} \sup_{\omega\in\Omega} \big(U_T(\omega) - U_{Tp}(\omega) \big) \le 0. \quad \forall p_0 > 1. \tag{3a}$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists a natural* N *such that*

$$V[w_\lambda](\omega) \ge U_{1/\lambda}(\omega) - \varepsilon \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \lambda \in (0, 1/N).$$

In Appendix C, we prove a similar proposition, where the payoff families are swapped:

Proposition 2 *For a game value map* V , *let a family of functions* $U_\lambda \in \mathfrak{U} (\lambda > 0)$ *and the family of functions* $V[v_T](T > 0)$ *be a subsolution for payoffs* w_λ *and a supersolution for payoffs* v_T , *respectively.*

Further, let $U_\lambda (\lambda > 0)$ *satisfy*

$$\limsup_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \sup_{p\in[1,p_0]} \sup_{\omega\in\Omega} \big(U_\lambda(\omega) - U_{p\lambda}(\omega) \big) \le 0 \qquad \forall p_0 > 1. \tag{3b}$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists a natural* N *such that*

$$V[v_T](\omega) \ge U_{1/T}(\omega) - \varepsilon \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, T > N.$$

The inequalities similar to ($3a$) will be found in other Tauberian Theorems, (see [8, Definition 4.1.4],[23, Sect.6.2],[37, Theorem 4.1]). Also, we may take $p = p_0$ instead of $\sup_{p\in[1,p_0]}$ in ($3a$) and ($3b$) for $U_T \stackrel{\triangle}{=} V[v_T]$ and $U_\lambda \stackrel{\triangle}{=} V[w_\lambda]$ using ($8a$) and ($8b$) (see Appendix A), respectively. On the other hand, conditions ($3a$) and ($3b$) are tight enough for $U_T \stackrel{\triangle}{=} V[v_T]$ and $U_\lambda \stackrel{\triangle}{=} V[w_\lambda]$, respectively. In particular, if in Proposition 2 one replaces ($3b$) with the following condition

$$\lim_{p_0\downarrow 1}\limsup_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\sup_{p\in[1,p_0]}\sup_{\omega\in\Omega}\left|V[w_\lambda](\omega)-V[w_{p\lambda}](\omega)\right|=0,$$

which holds for all game value maps from ($8b$), then Proposition 2 would fail for a certain game value map (see, for example, [40, Sect. 4] for control problems).

One-sided Tauberian theorems for bounds from below. Applying these propositions to $\mathfrak{C}^* \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \{-c \,|\, c\in\mathfrak{C}\}$, $V^*[c]\equiv -V[-c]$, $g^*\equiv 1-g$ instead of $\mathfrak{C}, V, g$, we obtain:

Proposition 3 *For a game value map V, let a family of functions $U_T \in \mathfrak{U}(T>0)$ and the family of functions $V[w_\lambda](\lambda>0)$ be a supersolution for the payoffs v_T and a subsolution for the payoffs w_λ, respectively.*

Further, let $U_T(T>0)$ satisfy

$$\limsup_{T\uparrow\infty}\sup_{p\in[1,p_0]}\sup_{\omega\in\Omega}\big(U_{Tp}(\omega)-U_T(\omega)\big)\le 0. \quad \forall p_0>1. \tag{3c}$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon>0$, there exists a natural N such that

$$V[w_\lambda](\omega)\le U_{1/\lambda}(\omega)+\varepsilon \qquad \forall\omega\in\Omega,\lambda\in(0,1/N).$$

Proposition 4 *For a game value map V, let a family of functions $U_\lambda \in \mathfrak{U}(\lambda>0)$ and the family of functions $V[v_T](T>0)$ be a supersolution for the payoffs w_λ and a subsolution for the payoffs v_T, respectively.*

Further, let $U_\lambda(\lambda>0)$ satisfy

$$\limsup_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\sup_{p\in[1,p_0]}\sup_{\omega\in\Omega}\big(U_{p\lambda}(\omega)-U_\lambda(\omega)\big)\le 0 \qquad \forall p_0>1. \tag{3d}$$

Then, for every $\varepsilon>0$, there exists a natural N such that

$$V[v_T](\omega)\le U_{1/T}(\omega)+\varepsilon \qquad \forall\omega\in\Omega,T>N.$$

For simplicity we could define $\mathfrak{C}$ as the set of all bounded maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. It would be sufficient for proofs of all theorems of this article. We do not do it due to the following reasons. First, in stochastic frameworks, each payoff c has to be measurable with respect to some measurable space, see, for instance, Corollary 2 in Sect. 5. Secondly, all proofs use merely

the boundedness of v_T, w_λ, and the additional requirement does not appear to help to obtain the bounds.

Also note that in the definitions of subsolution and supersolution, we consider only natural h and T. However, this strengthening is useless for continuous setting, whereas in discrete-time setting it allows a direct usage of the corresponding Dynamic Programming Principle (see Section 5).

4 Proofs of main results

Proof of Theorem 2. Since the payoffs $v_T (T > 0)$ and the payoffs $w_\lambda (\lambda > 0)$ enjoy the weak Dynamic Programming Principle, we see that $V[v_T](T > 0)$ and $V[w_\lambda](\lambda > 0)$ are simultaneously super- and subsolutions with respect to V for the payoffs v_T and for the payoffs w_λ respectively.

If at least one of the considered limits exists and is uniform in Ω, then, either the limit of $V[v_T]$ as $T \uparrow \infty$, or the limit of $V[w_\lambda]$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ exists and is uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$.

Assume that it is the limit of $V[v_T]$ as $T \uparrow \infty$. It follows that $(3a)$ and $(3c)$ hold for $U_T = V[v_T]$. From Propositions 1 and 3, we infer that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $|V[v_T](\omega) - V[w_{1/T}](\omega)| < \varepsilon$ holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$ if T is sufficient large. Thus, the limit of $V[w_\lambda]$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ exists, is uniform, and coincides with the limit of $V[v_T]$ as $T \uparrow \infty$.

The case of the limit for $V[w_\lambda]$ is considered analogously. It is only necessary to apply conditions $(3b)$ and $(3d)$ and Propositions 2 and 4. □

Proof of Theorem 1. Let the set of all bounded maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ be the set $\mathfrak{C}$. This set satisfies $(2a)$, and w_λ, v_T, $\zeta^{\mathcal{V}_T}_{T,h}, \xi^{\mathcal{W}_\lambda}_{\lambda,h} \in \mathfrak{C}$ for all positive λ, T and natural h. Note that the map $\mathbb{V}$ (see (1)) takes each payoff $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ to a function $\mathbb{V}[c] : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. Since $\mathbb{V}$ satisfies conditions $(2b)$–$(2c)$, this map is a game value map.

To finish the proof, we can now apply Theorem 2. □

5 Tauberian theorem in discrete time setting

On dynamics. Let there be given sets Ω, $\mathbb{K}$ and a running cost g, as before. Assume that we would like to consider any process as a function from $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ to Ω. Since, for such a function, its definition can be completed in the form

$$z(k + t) \triangleq z(k) \quad \forall k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}, t \in (0, 1), \tag{4}$$

we can propose that this function is from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to Ω and lies in $\mathbb{K}$. Thus, in this section, we can assume that all $z \in \mathbb{K}$ satisfy (4).

On payoffs. Recall that $\mathfrak{U}$ is the set of all bounded maps from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$. Let us consider a non-empty set $\mathfrak{C}$ of maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and a game value map $V : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$ satisfying conditions $(2a)$ and $(2b), (2c)$, respectively.

For all $\mu \in (0,1), n \in \mathbb{N}$, define payoffs $\bar{v}_n : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}, \bar{w}_\mu : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\bar{v}_n(z) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=0}^{n-1} g(z(t)) \in [0,1], \quad \bar{w}_\mu(z) = \mu\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}(1-\mu)^t g(z(t)) \in [0,1] \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{K}.$$

Also, assume that $\bar{v}_n, \bar{w}_\mu \in \mathfrak{C}$ for all $\mu \in (0,1), n \in \mathbb{N}$.

On Dynamic Programming Principle. Let us say that the family of payoffs $\bar{v}_n (n \in \mathbb{N})$ enjoys *the Dynamic Programming Principle* iff, for all $n, h \in \mathbb{N}$, the payoff

$$\bar{\mathbb{K}} \ni z \mapsto \frac{1}{n+h}\sum_{t=0}^{h-1} g(z(t)) + \frac{n}{n+h} V[\bar{v}_n](z(h)) \tag{5a}$$

lies in $\mathfrak{C}$ and the value of V for this payoff coincides with $V[\bar{v}_{n+h}]$

Let us say that the family of payoffs $\bar{w}_\mu (\mu > 0)$ enjoys *the Dynamic Programming Principle* iff, for all $\mu \in (0,1)$, the function $V[\bar{w}_\mu]$ coincides with values of V for payoffs

$$\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto \mu\sum_{t=0}^{h-1}(1-\mu)^t g(z(t)) + (1-\mu)^h V[\bar{w}_\mu](z(h)) \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{5b}$$

and each of these payoffs lies in $\mathfrak{C}$.

Theorem 3 *Let all processes $z \in \mathbb{K}$ satisfy (4). Let, for a game value map $V : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$, the payoff families $\bar{v}_n (n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $\bar{w}_\mu (\mu > 0)$ enjoy the Dynamic Programming Principle.*

Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

(i) The sequence of functions $V[\bar{v}_n]$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ converges uniformly on Ω as $n \uparrow \infty$.

(ii) The family of functions $V[\bar{w}_\mu]$ $(0 < \mu < 1)$ converges uniformly on Ω as $\mu \downarrow 0$.

Moreover, when at least one of these statements holds, we have

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} V[\bar{v}_n](\omega) = \lim_{\mu\downarrow 0} V[\bar{w}_\mu](\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

Proof of Theorem 3. We will use estimate $(8a)$ and Lemma 1 proved in Appendix A.

Denote by $\mathfrak{C}_b$ the set of all bounded maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. We can assume $\mathfrak{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_b$; otherwise, we would always use $\mathfrak{C} \cap \mathfrak{C}_b$ instead of $\mathfrak{C}$. Now, by Lemma 1, we can set $V[c] \in \mathfrak{U}$ for all $c \in \mathfrak{C}_b \setminus \mathfrak{C}$ such that conditions $(2b)$–$(2c)$ keep to hold. Thus, we obtain the game value map $V : \mathfrak{C}_b \to \mathfrak{U}$.

Consider a function $\mu^* : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to (0,1)$ defined as follows: $\mu^*(\lambda) = 1 - e^{-\lambda}$ for all $\lambda > 0$. Then, $\int_t^{t+1} \lambda e^{-\lambda r}\, dr = e^{-\lambda t}\mu^*(\lambda) = (1-\mu^*(\lambda))^t \mu^*(\lambda)$ for all $t \geq 0, \lambda > 0$. Now, (4) implies

$\bar{w}_{\mu^*(\lambda)} \equiv w_\lambda$ for all $\lambda > 0$. Note that $\mu^*(0+) = 0+$. Then, the limit of $V[\bar{w}_\mu]$ as $\mu \downarrow 0$ exists and is uniform in Ω iff the limit of $V[w_\lambda]$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ exists and is uniform in Ω. Moreover, in this case, these limits coincide.

Also, it is easy to see that $\bar{v}_n \equiv v_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the payoffs $v_T(T > 0)$ are bounded, we have $v_T \in \mathfrak{C}_b$ for all $T > 0$. For each $T > 0$, we can choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T \in (n-1, n]$, hence, we obtain

$$|V[\bar{v}_n](\omega) - V[v_T](\omega)| \overset{(8a)}{\leq} \frac{2(n-T)}{T} \leq \frac{2}{T} \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

Thus, the limit of $V[\bar{v}_T]$ as $T \uparrow \infty$ exists and is uniform in Ω iff the limit of $V[\bar{v}_n]$ as $n \to \infty$ exists and is uniform in Ω. Moreover, in this case, these limits coincide.

At last, thanks to (4) and $\bar{w}_{\mu^*(\lambda)} \equiv w_\lambda$, $\bar{v}_n \equiv v_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda > 0$, we have that, for all natural $T = n, h \in \mathbb{N}$ and positive λ, payoffs (5a) and (5b) coincide with $\zeta_{T,h}^{V[v_T]}$ and $\xi_{\lambda,h}^{V[w_\lambda]}$, respectively. Therefore, the payoff families $w_\lambda(\lambda > 0)$ and $v_T(T > 0)$ enjoy the weak Dynamic Programming Principle.

We have verified all conditions of Theorem 2. Moreover, the corresponding limits in Theorem 2 and in Theorem 3 exist and are uniform in $\omega \in \Omega$ only simultaneously. Thanks to Theorem 2, Theorem 3 is proved. □

Let us showcase the application of this approach in a stochastic framework.

Consider a σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathbb{K}$. Assume that $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the set of all $\mathcal{A}$-measurable bounded maps of $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the condition (2a).

Similarly to Section 2, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, let there be given non-empty sets $\mathcal{L}(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\omega)$. Let, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, each pair $(l, m) \in \mathcal{L}(\omega) \times \mathcal{M}(\omega)$ of players' rules induce a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_{lm}^\omega$ (over $(\mathbb{K}, \mathcal{A})$) along with its mathematical expectation $\mathbb{E}_{lm}^\omega$. Similarly to (1), define the map $W : \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathfrak{U}$ by the following rule: for each $c \in \mathfrak{C}$,

$$W[c](\omega) \overset{\triangle}{=} \sup_{l \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}(\omega)} \mathbb{E}_{lm}^\omega c \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{6}$$

Evidently, $W : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$ satisfies conditions (2b), (2c). Thus, W is a game value map.

Applying Theorem 3 for this game value map W, we obtain

Corollary 2 *Let all processes $z \in \mathbb{K}$ satisfy (4). Also, assume that for all $\mu \in (0,1)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the payoffs $\bar{v}_n, \bar{w}_\mu$ are $\mathcal{A}$-measurable.*

Let, for the game value map $W : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$ (see (6)), the payoff families $\bar{v}_n (n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $\bar{w}_\mu (0 < \mu < 1)$ enjoy the Dynamic Programming Principle.

Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

($\imath$) *The maps $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \sup_{l \in \mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}(\omega)} \mathbb{E}_{lm}^\omega \bar{v}_n$ converge uniformly on Ω as $n \uparrow \infty$.*

(*ii*) *The maps* $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \sup\limits_{l\in\mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf\limits_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\omega)} \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{lm}\bar{w}_{\mu}$ *converge uniformly on* Ω *as* $\mu \downarrow 0$.

Moreover, when at least one of these statements holds, we have

$$\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\omega)} \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{lm}\bar{v}_n = \lim_{\mu\downarrow 0} \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}(\omega)} \inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\omega)} \mathbb{E}^{\omega}_{lm}\bar{w}_{\mu} \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

6 Differential games without saddle point.

Dynamic equation. Consider a nonlinear system in $\mathbb{R}^m$ controlled by two players,

$$\dot{x} = f(x,a,b),\ x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^m, a(t) \in \mathbb{A},\ b(t) \in \mathbb{B}; \tag{7}$$

here, $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$ are non-empty compact subsets of finite-dimensional Euclidean spaces.

In this section, we assume that

1. the functions $f : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^m$, $g : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B} \to [0,1]$ are continuous;

2. these functions are Lipschitz continuous in the state variable, namely, for a constant $L > 0$,

$$\big|\big|f(x,a,b) - f(y,a,b)\big|\big| + \big|g(x,a,b) - g(y,a,b)\big| \le L\big|\big|x-y\big|\big|\ \forall x,y \in \mathbb{R}^m, a \in \mathbb{A}, b \in \mathbb{B}.$$

Denote by $B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{A})$ and by $B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{B})$ the sets of all Borel measurable functions $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto a(t) \in \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto b(t) \in \mathbb{B}$, respectively. Now, for each pair $(a,b) \in B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{A}) \times B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{B})$, for every initial condition $x(0) = x_*$, system (7) generates the unique solution $x(\cdot) = y(\cdot; x_*, a, b)$ defined for the whole $\mathbb{R}_+$. Denote by $Y(x_*)$ the set of all such solutions with $x(0) = x_*$.

Consider a set $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ that is strongly invariant with respect to system (7), i.e., let $x(t) \in \mathbb{X}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $x_* \in \mathbb{X}, x \in Y(x_*)$. Set $\mathbb{Y} \triangleq \cup_{x_*\in\mathbb{X}} Y(x_*)$.

On strategies of players. Like before, let the goal of the first player be to maximize the payoff function and let the task of the second one be to minimize it. Our payoff functions are as follows: for all $\lambda, T > 0, (x,a,b) \in \mathbb{Y} \times B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{A}) \times B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{B})$,

$$v_T(x,a,b) \triangleq \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(x(t),a(t),b(t))\,dt,$$
$$w_\lambda(x,a,b) \triangleq \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(x(t),a(t),b(t))\,dt.$$

In the general case, without Isaacs's condition, the lower game value and the upper game value depend on choosing the formalization of strategies of players [30, Ch. XVI], [47, Subsect. 14], [5]. For simplicity, we now assume that the first player announces a nonanticipating strategy (see [15, 44, 45]) and another, knowing it, selects an admissible measurable control.

Definition 3 *A map* $\alpha : B(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{B}) \mapsto B(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{A})$ *is called a nonanticipating strategy for the first player if, for all* $t > 0$ *and* $b, b' \in B(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{B})$, $b|_{[0,t]} = b'|_{[0,t]}$ *implies that* $\alpha[b]|_{[0,t]} = \alpha[b']|_{[0,t]}$. *We denote by* $\mathcal{A}$ *the set of all nonanticipating strategies for the first player.*

Now, for all $T, \lambda > 0$, we can define lower game values,

$$\mathcal{V}_T(x_*) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{B})} v_T(y(\cdot; x_*, \alpha(b), b), \alpha(b), b) \qquad \forall x_* \in \mathbb{X},$$

$$\mathcal{W}_\lambda(x_*) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{B})} w_\lambda(y(\cdot; x_*, \alpha(b), b), \alpha(b), b) \qquad \forall x_* \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Constructing a game value map. Let us set

$$\Omega \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}, \quad \mathbb{K} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{Y} \times B(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{A}) \times B(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{B}).$$

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the set of all bounded maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$; this set satisfies $(2a)$, and w_λ, v_T, $\zeta^{\mathcal{V}_T}_{T,h}, \xi^{\mathcal{W}_\lambda}_{\lambda,h} \in \mathfrak{C}$ for each positive λ, T and natural h. For every map $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, we can consider the following value function:

$$V[c](x_*, a_*, b_*) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{b\in B(\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{B})} c(y(\cdot; x_*, \alpha(b), b), \alpha(b), b) \qquad \forall \omega = (x_*, a_*, b_*) \in \Omega.$$

It is easy prove that $V : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$ satisfies $(2b), (2c)$. Thus, we obtain the game value map V.

The dynamic programming principle with respect to nonanticipating strategies for Bolza functionals (particularly, for the payoffs v_T) is well-known, see [16, 47]. Such a principle for the payoff function w_λ follows from [4, Theorem VIII.1.9]. All conditions of Theorem 2 verify. Moreover, $V[w_\lambda] \equiv \mathcal{W}_\lambda$, $V[v_T] \equiv \mathcal{V}_T$ are independent of a_*, b_*. Now, thanks to Theorem 2, we obtain

Theorem 4 *Let* f, g *be as before, and let a non-empty set* $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ *be strongly invariant with respect to* (7).

Then, for a function $U_* : \mathbb{X} \to [0, 1]$, U_* *is a limit of* $\mathcal{V}_T$ *as* $T \uparrow \infty$ *that is uniform in* $\mathbb{X}$ *iff* U_* *is a limit of* $\mathcal{W}_\lambda$ *as* $\lambda \downarrow 0$ *that is uniform in* $\mathbb{X}$.

Under Isaacs's condition, this theorem was proved in [26].

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Ya.V. Salii for the translation. I am grateful to an anonymous referee for helpful comments. This study was supported by the Russian Foundation for the Program of Basic Researches of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Project 15-16-1-8 "Control Synthesis under Incomplete Data, the Reachability Problems and Dynamic Optimization") and by by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project no. 16-01-00505.

References

[1] Alvarez O, Bardi M (2007) Ergodic problems in differential games. In: Advances in dynamic game theory. Birkhäuser, Boston, pp.131-152

[2] Arisawa M (1998) Ergodic problem for the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation II. Ann Inst Henri Poincare 15:1-24

[3] Arisawa M, Lions P (1998) On ergodic stochastic control. Comm part diff eq 23(11-12):2187-2217

[4] Bardi M (2009) On differential games with long-time-average cost. In: Advances in dynamic games and their applications. Birkhäuser, Boston, pp. 3-18

[5] Bardi M, Capuzzo-Dolcetta I (1997) Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. Birkhauser, Boston

[6] Barles G, Souganidis PE (2000) On the large time behavior of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. SIAM J Math Anal, 31(4):925–939

[7] Bewley T, Kohlberg E (1976) The asymptotic theory of stochastic games. Math Oper Res 1:197-208

[8] Bingham NH, Goldie CM, Teugels JL (1989) Regular variation. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge

[9] Blackwell D (1962) Discrete dynamic programming, Ann Math Statist 33(2):719-726

[10] Buckdahn R, Cardaliaguet P, Quincampoix M (2011) Some Recent Aspects of Differential Game Theory. Dyn Games Appl 1(1):74-114

[11] Cannarsa P, Quincampoix M (2015) Vanishing Discount Limit and Nonexpansive Optimal Control and Differential Games. SIAM J Control Optim, 53(4):1789-1814

[12] Carlson DA, Haurie AB, Leizarowitz A (1991) Optimal Control on Infinite Time Horizon. Springer, Berlin

[13] Chentsov AG, Khlopin DV (2000) Some Constructions of Extension of Game Problems with Information Discrimination. Journal of Automation and Information Sciences, 32(12):1-11

[14] Colonius F, Kliemann W (1989) Infinite time optimal control and periodicity. Appl Math Optim 20:113–130

[15] Elliott RJ, Kalton N (1972) The existence of value for differential games. Mem Am Math Soc, vol 126. AMS, Providence

[16] Evans L, Souganidis PE (1984) Differential games and representation formulas for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations. Indiana Univ Math J 33:773-797

[17] Fathi A. (1998) Sur la convergence du semi-groupe de Lax-Oleinik. Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics, 327(3):267–270

[18] Feller W (1971) An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications, vol. II, 2nd ed. Wiley, New York

[19] Fisac JF, Sastry SS (2015, December). The pursuit-evasion-defense differential game in dynamic constrained environments. In: 2015 IEEE 54th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), December 15-18, 2015, IEEE, pp. 4549-4556.

[20] Gaitsgory V (1985) Application of the averaging method for constructing suboptimal solutions of singularly perturbed problems of optimal control. Automat Rem Contr+ 9:22-30

[21] Gaitsgory V, Quincampoix M (2013) On sets of occupational measures generated by a deterministic control system on an infinite time horizon. Nonlinear Anal-Theor 88:27-41

[22] Grüne L (1998) On The Relation Between Discounted And Average Optimal Value Functions. J Diff Eq 148:65-99

[23] Hardy GH (1949) Divergent Series. Clarendon Press, Oxford

[24] Jaśkiewicz A, Nowak AS (2016) Zero-Sum Stochastic Games, preprint

[25] Khlopin DV (2014) On uniform Tauberian theorems for dynamic games, arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.7331

[26] Khlopin DV (2015) Uniform Tauberian theorem for differential games. Mat Teor Igr Prilozh 1:92-120 (In Russian). In English translate: Automat Rem Contr+, 2016 77(4):734–750

[27] Khlopin DV (2015) On Asymptotic Value for Dynamic Games with Saddle Point. Eds: C.Bonnet, B.Pasik-Duncan, H.Ozbay and Q.Zhang. 2015 Proceedings of the Conference on Control and Its Applications, SIAM, pp.282-289. arXiv:1501.06993, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974072.39

[28] Khlopin DV (2016) On an example for the Uniform Tauberian theorem in abstract control systems. arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07111

[29] Korevaar J (2002) A century of complex Tauberian theory. Bull American Math Soc 39(4):475-531

[30] Krasovskii NN, Subbotin AI (1974) Positional differential games. Nauka, Moskow (in Russian)

[31] Lacker D (2016) Limit theory for controlled McKean-Vlasov dynamics. arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08064

[32] Laraki R, Sorin S (2014) Recursive games. In Advances in Zero-Sum Dynamic Games. In: Young P, Zamir S (eds) Handbook of Game Theory, pp.27-95.

[33] Lehrer E, Sorin S (1992) A uniform Tauberian theorem in dynamic programming. Math Oper Res 17(2):303-307

[34] Li X, Quincampoix M, Renault J (2016) Limit value for optimal control with general means, Discrete Contin Dyn Syst. Series A, 36:2113-2132

[35] Li X, Venel X (2016) Recursive games: uniform value, Tauberian theorem and the Mertens conjecture "$\max\min = \lim v_n = \lim v_\lambda$. Int J of Game Theory, 45(1):155-189

[36] Lions P, Papanicolaou G, Varadhan SRS. Homogenization of Hamilton- Jacobi Equations, unpublished work.

[37] Mertens JF, Neyman A (1981) Stochastic Games. Internat J Game Theory 10(2):53-66

[38] Monderer D, Sorin S (1993) Asymptotic properties in dynamic programming. Int J of Game Theory, 22(1):1-11

[39] Øksendal B (2013) Stochastic differential equations: an introduction with applications. Springer, New York.

[40] Oliu-Barton M, Vigeral G (2013) A uniform Tauberian theorem in optimal control. In: Advances in Dynamic Games. Birkhäuser, Boston, pp.199-215. Erratum: *HAL preprint hal*:00661833v3, 2016

[41] Quincampoix M, Renault J (2011) On the existence of a limit value in some non expansive optimal control problems. SIAM J Control Optim 49(5):2118-2132

[42] Renault J (2011) Uniform value in dynamic programming. J Eur Math Soc 13:309-330

[43] Renault J (2013) General limit value in dynamic programming. J Dyn and Games, 1(3):471-484

[44] Roxin E (1969) Axiomatic approach in differential games. J Optim Theory Appl 3(3):153-163

[45] Ryll-Nardzewski C (1964) A theory of pursuit and evasion. In Advances in Game Theory. Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 113-126

[46] Sorin S (2011) Zero-sum repeated games: recent advances and new links with differential games. Dyn Games Appl 1(1):172-207

[47] Subbotin AI (1995) Generalized solutions of first order PDEs. Birkhauser, Boston

[48] Vigeral G (2013) A zero-sum stochastic game with compact action sets and no asymptotic value. Dyn Games Appl 3:172-186

[49] Ziliotto B (2015) A Tauberian theorem for nonexpansive operators and applications to zero-sum stochastic games. arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.06525

[50] Ziliotto B (2016) General limit value in zero-sum stochastic games. Int J Game Theory 45:353-374

A Auxiliary statements.

Assume a non-empty set $\mathfrak{C}$ satisfies $(2a)$ and a game value map $V : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$ enjoys $(2b)$, $(2c)$.

Two estimates. Consider $T > 0, r > 1$, and $z \in \mathbb{K}$. Assume $v_T, v_{rT} \in \mathfrak{C}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |v_T(z) - v_{rT}(z)| &= \Big|\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T g(z(t))\,dt - \frac{1}{rT}\int_0^{rT} g(z(t))\,dt\Big| \\ &\le \Big|\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{rT}\Big|\int_0^T g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{1}{rT}\int_T^{rT} g(z(t))\,dt \\ &\le 1 - \frac{1}{r} + \frac{r-1}{r} = \frac{2r-2}{r} < 2(r-1). \end{aligned}$$

So, $v_{rT}(z) - 2(r-1) \le v_T(z) \le v_{rT}(z) + 2(r-1)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{K}$. Thanks to $(2b), (2c)$, we obtain

$$\Big|V[v_T](\omega) - V[v_{rT}](\omega)\Big| \le 2(r-1) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{8a}$$

Consider $\lambda > 0, r > 1$, and $z \in \mathbb{K}$. Assume $w_\lambda, w_{r\lambda} \in \mathfrak{C}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |w_\lambda(z) - w_{r\lambda}(z)| &= \Big|\lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt - r\lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-r\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt\Big| \\ &\le \int_0^\infty |\lambda e^{-\lambda t} - r\lambda e^{-r\lambda t}| g(z(t))\, dt \\ &\le \int_0^\infty |\lambda e^{-\lambda t} - r\lambda e^{-r\lambda t}|\, dt \\ &= 2\int_0^\infty \max\{\lambda e^{-\lambda t}, r\lambda e^{-r\lambda t}\}\, dt - \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda t}\, dt - \int_0^\infty r\lambda e^{-r\lambda t}\, dt \\ &\le 2\int_0^\infty r\lambda e^{-\lambda t}\, dt - 2 = 2(r-1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\Big|V[w_\lambda](\omega) - V[w_{r\lambda}](\omega)\Big| \le 2(r-1) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{8b}$$

On extension of V. Denote by $\mathfrak{C}_b$ the set of all bounded maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Assume $\mathfrak{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_b$.

Note that $(2a)$ holds for $\mathfrak{C}_b$. Define a map $\mathbb{V}_b : \mathfrak{C}_b \to \mathfrak{U}$ as follows:

$$\mathbb{V}_b[c'](\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup\{V[c](\omega) \,|\, c \in \mathfrak{C}, c \le c'\} \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, c' \in \mathfrak{C}_b.$$

Since, for all $R \in \mathbb{R}, c \in \mathfrak{C}$, the inequality $-R \le c \le R$ implies $-R = V[-R] \le V[c] \le V[R] = R$ by $(2b), (2c)$, the function $\mathbb{V}_b[c']$ is well-defined and bounded for every $c' \in \mathfrak{C}_b$. It is easy to prove that $(2b)$ and $(2c)$ hold for $\mathbb{V}_b$. In addition,

$$\mathbb{V}_b[c''](\omega) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup\{V[c](\omega) \,|\, c \in \mathfrak{C}, c \le c''\} \stackrel{(2c)}{=} V[c''](\omega) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega, c'' \in \mathfrak{C}.$$

So, $\mathbb{V}_b|_{\mathfrak{C}} \equiv V$. Thus, we have proved

Lemma 1 *Let a non-empty set $\mathfrak{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_b$ satisfy $(2a)$ and a map $V : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{U}$ enjoy $(2b)$ and $(2c)$. Then, the map $\mathbb{V}_b : \mathfrak{C}_b \to \mathfrak{U}$ enjoys $(2b)$ and $(2c)$ and is an extension of V.*

B The proof of Proposition 1.

On simplicity of notation.

For all payoff functions c, let us also use the following notation:

$$[c]_\omega \equiv V[c](\omega) \qquad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

For instance, for a function $U_* : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, the symbol $[U_*(z(1))]_\omega$ means $V[c](\omega)$ for the payoff function $\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto c(z) = U_*(z(1)) \in \mathbb{R}$. The symbol $[U_*(z_1(1))]_\omega$ also means the same for the same payoff. Moreover, the symbols

$$\Big[\int_0^h a(t) g(z(t))\, dt + U_*(z(h))\Big]_\omega, \ \Big[[U_*(z_1(1))]_{z(1)}\Big]_\omega, \ \Big[\int_0^h b(t) g(z_1(t))\, dt + [c]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h')}$$

denote the value of the game value map for the payoff function $\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto \int_0^h a(t)g(z(t))\,dt + U_*(z(h)) \in \mathbb{R}$ at ω, for the payoff function $\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto c_1(z) = [U_*(z_1(1))]_{z(1)} \in \mathbb{R}$ at ω, for the payoff function

$$\mathbb{K} \ni z_1 \mapsto \int_0^h b(t)g(z_1(t))\,dt + V[c](z_1(h)) \in \mathbb{R}$$

at $z(h')$, respectively. Now, the expression $\Big[[U_*(z_5(1))]_{z_2(1)}\Big]_\omega$ is equal to $\Big[[U_*(z_1(1))]_{z(1)}\Big]_\omega$, similarly to e.g. the equivalence of $\int_A f(x)\int_B g(y)dydx$ and $\int_A f(r)\int_B g(s)dsdr$.

Auxiliary estimates. Recall that $\mathfrak{C}_b$ is the set of all bounded maps from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathfrak{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_b$; otherwise, we could always use $\mathfrak{C} \cap \mathfrak{C}_b$ instead of $\mathfrak{C}$. Further, we can assume that $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_b$; otherwise, applying Lemma 1, we could always define V on $\mathfrak{C}_b \setminus \mathfrak{C}$ such that conditions $(2b)$–$(2c)$ keep to hold. Thus, we obtain the value $V[c]$ for all bounded payoffs $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Set

$$\kappa(T, p_0) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{p\in[1,p_0]} \sup_{\omega\in\Omega} \big(U_{Tp^{-1}}(\omega) - U_T(\omega)\big) \quad \forall T > 0, p_0 > 1.$$

Fix some positive $\varepsilon < 1/4$. Applying $2\varepsilon \le \varepsilon^{1/2}$, we can choose some natural $k \ge 2$ such that $\varepsilon^{1/2} \le k\varepsilon \le (k+1)\varepsilon \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Set $p \stackrel{\triangle}{=} 1 + \frac{1}{k}$; we have

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{p-1} \le \frac{p\varepsilon}{p-1} = (k+1)\varepsilon \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad 2(p-1) = \frac{2}{k} \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

By the definitions of the subsolution and the supersolution, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive $\bar{T}$ such that, for all $\lambda \in (0, 1/\bar{T}), \omega \in \Omega$, and natural $h > \bar{T}, T > \bar{T} + h$,

$$U_T(\omega) \le V\big[\zeta_{h,T}^{U_{T-h}}\big](\omega) + \varepsilon/2 = \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T-h}{T}U_{T-h}(z(h)) + \varepsilon/2\right]_\omega, \tag{9}$$

$$V[w_\lambda](\omega) \ge V\big[\xi_{h,\lambda}^{V[w_\lambda]}\big](\omega) - \varepsilon/3 = \left[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t}g(z(t))\,dt + e^{-\lambda h}V[w_\lambda](z(h)) - \varepsilon/3\right]_\omega. \tag{10}$$

By $(3a)$, there exists $\hat{T} > \max\{\bar{T}, \frac{1}{\ln p}\}$ such that $\kappa(T, p') \le \kappa(T, p) \le \varepsilon/2$ holds for all $T > \hat{T}$, $p' \in (1, p]$.

The special choice of λ. Fix every $\lambda < \frac{1}{(k+1)\hat{T}}$ such that $\frac{\ln p}{\lambda}$ is a natural number; set

$$h \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{\ln p}{\lambda},\ T \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{p\ln p}{\lambda(p-1)} = (k+1)h,\ q \stackrel{\triangle}{=} p^{-1} = e^{-\lambda h} = \frac{T-h}{T}, \tag{11}$$

Observe that h, $T = (k+1)h$, and $T - h = kh$ are natural. It is easy to verify that $p > 1$ implies that $\ln p < p - 1 < p\ln p$. Then,

$$\frac{p}{\lambda} > T = \frac{p\ln p}{\lambda(p-1)} = \frac{h}{1-q} > \frac{1}{\lambda} > (k+1)\hat{T}. \tag{12}$$

In particular, from the inequalities $T = h(k+1) > (k+1)\hat{T}$ and $T - h \geq h > \hat{T}$, it follows that T, h, λ satisfy (9), (10). Also, $T\lambda = \frac{p \ln p}{p-1} \in (1, p)$ guarantees that

$$U_{1/\lambda}(\omega) \leq U_T(\omega) + \kappa(T, T\lambda) \leq U_T(\omega) + \varepsilon/2 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \tag{13}$$

Forward-tracking. For all $\omega \in \Omega$, from (9) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) &\overset{(9)}{\leq} \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T-h}{T} U_{T-h}(z(h)) + \varepsilon/2\right]_\omega \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T-h}{T} U_T(z(h)) + \varepsilon/2 + \kappa(T,p)\right]_\omega \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + qU_T(z(h))\right]_\omega + \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The inequality will still hold if we replace the symbol z inside the square brackets with e.g. z_1. We have

$$U_T(\omega) \overset{(14)}{\leq} \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z_1(t))\,dt + qU_T(z_1(h))\right]_\omega + \varepsilon.$$

In particular, for all $z \in \mathbb{K}$, we get

$$U_T(z(h)) \overset{(14)}{\leq} \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z_1(t))\,dt + qU_T(z_1(h))\right]_{z(h)} + \varepsilon.$$

Substituting the corresponding part into (14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) &\leq \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + qU_T(z(h))\right]_\omega + \varepsilon \\ &\overset{(2c)}{\leq} \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt + q^2 U_T(z_1(h))\right]_{z(h)} + q\varepsilon\right]_\omega + \varepsilon \\ &\overset{(2b)}{=} \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt + q^2 U_T(z_1(h))\right]_{z(h)}\right]_\omega + \varepsilon(1+q). \end{aligned}$$

Repeating, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) &\leq \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^2 g(z_2(t))\,dt + q^3 U_T(z_2(h))\Big]_{z_1(h)} + q^2\varepsilon\Big]_{z(h)}\right]_\omega + \varepsilon(1+q) \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^2 g(z_2(t))\,dt + q^3 U_T(z_2(h))\Big]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h)}\right]_\omega + \varepsilon(1+q+q^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in a similar way, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) \;\le\; & \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^2 g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^n g(z_n(t))\,dt + q^{n+1}U_T(z_n(h))\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h)}\Big]_\omega \\ & + \varepsilon(1+q+q^2+\cdots+q^n). \end{aligned}$$

Backtracking. Since U_T is bounded, we can choose natural n such that $U_T q^{n+1} \le \varepsilon^{1/2}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) \;\le\; & \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^2 g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^n g(z_n(t))\,dt + \varepsilon^{1/2}\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h)}\Big]_\omega + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-q} \\ \le\; & \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^2 g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^n g(z_n(t))\,dt\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h)}\Big]_\omega + \varepsilon^{1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-q}. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of p, we have $\frac{\varepsilon}{1-q} = \frac{p\varepsilon}{p-1} \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$. In addition, $T\lambda \ge 1$ by (12). Now, $g \ge 0$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) \;\le\; & \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h qg(z_1(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^2 g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h q^n g(z_n(t))\,dt\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h)}\Big]_\omega + \varepsilon^{1/2} + 2\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ \le\; & \Big[\int_0^h \lambda g(z(t))\,dt + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda g(z_1(t))\,dt + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda g(z_n(t))\,dt\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(h)}\Big]_{z(h)}\Big]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\lambda = \frac{\ln p}{h}$ by (11). Also, thanks to (11), we have $pe^{-\lambda t} \ge pe^{-\lambda h} = pq = 1$ for all

$t \in [0,h]$. It follows from $g \geq 0$ and $V[w_\lambda] \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) \quad \leq \quad & \Big[\int_0^h p\lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + q\Big[\int_0^h p\lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt \\ & + \cdots + q\Big[\int_0^h p\lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_n(t))\, dt + V[w_\lambda](z_n(h))\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \ldots \Big]_{z(h)} \Big]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ \overset{(2b)}{=} \quad & p\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt \\ & + \cdots + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_n(t))\, dt + qV[w_\lambda](z_n(h))\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \ldots \Big]_{z(h)} \Big]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $V[w_\lambda]$ is a supersolution (see (10)), in view of $q = e^{-\lambda h}$, we obtain

$$q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_n(t))\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} V[w_\lambda](z_n(h))\Big]_{z_{n-1}(h)} \leq e^{-\lambda h} V[w_\lambda](z_{n-1}(h)) + q\varepsilon/3.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) \quad \leq \quad & p\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt + \cdots + q\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z_{n-1}(t))\, dt \\ & + e^{-\lambda h} V[w_\lambda](z_{n-1}(h))\Big]_{z_{n-2}(h)} \ldots \Big]_{z(h)} \Big]_\omega + pq^n\varepsilon/3 + 3\varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in a similar way, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(\omega) \quad & \leq \quad p\Big[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} V[w_\lambda](z(h))\Big]_\omega + p(q + q^2 + \cdots + q^n)\varepsilon/2 + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ & \leq \quad pV[w_\lambda](\omega) + p(1 + q + q^2 + \cdots + q^n)\varepsilon/3 + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ & \leq \quad pV[w_\lambda](\omega) + 2p\varepsilon^{1/2}/3 + 3\varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $p \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2}$ and $(p-1)V[w_\lambda] \leq p - 1 \leq \varepsilon^{1/2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_{1/\lambda} \overset{(13)}{\leq} U_T + \varepsilon/2 \quad & \leq \quad pV[w_\lambda] + 5\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon/2 \\ & \leq \quad V[w_\lambda] + (p-1) + 5\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon/2 \leq V[w_\lambda] + 6\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon/2 \qquad (15) \end{aligned}$$

for all positive $\lambda < \frac{1}{(k+1)\hat{T}}$ such that $\frac{\ln p}{\lambda}$ is a natural number.

The general case. For positive $\lambda' < \frac{1}{(k+1)\hat{T}}$, we can choose positive $r > 1$ such that $\frac{r \ln p}{\lambda'}$ is a natural number and $0 \leq \frac{r \ln p}{\lambda'} - \frac{\ln p}{\lambda'} \leq 1$. Recall that, by the choice of $\hat{T}$, we have $\hat{T} \ln p \geq 1$. By the choice of $\hat{T}$ and λ', we obtain

$$1 \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda'}{\ln p} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{k+1} < p.$$

First, thanks to $(8b)$, we get

$$V[w_{\lambda'/r}] \overset{(8b)}{\le} V[w_{\lambda'}] + 2(r-1) \le V[w_{\lambda'}] + 2(p-1) \le V[w_{\lambda'}] + 2\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Secondly, $\lambda'/r < \lambda' < \frac{1}{(k+1)\hat{T}}$ guarantees (15) for $\lambda = \lambda'/r$ because $\frac{\ln p}{\lambda}$ is natural. At last, by the definition of κ and by the choice of $\hat{T}$ and λ', we get

$$U_{1/\lambda'} - U_{r/\lambda'} \le \kappa(r/\lambda', r) \le \kappa(r/\lambda', p) \le \varepsilon/2.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$U_{1/\lambda'} \le U_{r/\lambda'} + \varepsilon/2 \overset{(15)}{\le} V[w_{\lambda'/r}] + 6\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon \le V[w_{\lambda'}] + 8\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon \le V[w_{\lambda'}] + 9\varepsilon^{1/2}$$

for all sufficiently small positive λ'. By arbitrariness of positive ε, the proof is complete. $\square$

C The proof of Proposition 2.

We will continue the notation of the previous section for values of the game value map V. For instance, the symbols $\left[\int_0^h a(t)g(z(t))\,dt + U_*(z(h))\right]_\omega$, $\left[\int_0^h b(t)g(z_1(t))\,dt + [c]_{z_1(h)}\right]_{z(h')}$ denote the values of the game value map for a payoff $\mathbb{K} \ni z \mapsto \int_0^h a(t)g(z(t))\,dt + U_*(z(h)) \in \mathbb{R}$ at ω and for a payoff $\mathbb{K} \ni z_1 \mapsto \int_0^h b(t)g(z_1(t))\,dt + V[c](z_1(h)) \in \mathbb{R}$ at $z(h')$, respectively.

Also, as in the proof of Proposition 1, we can assume that $\mathfrak{C}$ coincides with the set of all bounded functions $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ and the game value $V[c]$ is correct for all bounded payoffs $c : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies $(2b)-(2c)$.

Auxiliary estimates. For each positive $\varepsilon < 1/4$, we can choose natural $k \ge 2$ such that $\varepsilon^{1/2} \le k\varepsilon \le (k+1)\varepsilon \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$. Set $p \overset{\triangle}{=} 1 + \frac{1}{k}$. Choose natural n such that $2p^{-n} < \varepsilon^{1/2}$. Now,

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{p-1} \le \frac{p\varepsilon}{p-1} = (k+1)\varepsilon \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad 2(p-1) = \frac{2}{k} \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}, \quad 2p^{-n} < \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Set

$$\kappa(\lambda, p_0) \overset{\triangle}{=} \sup_{p' \in [1,p_0]} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(U_\lambda(\omega) - U_{p'\lambda}(\omega)\right) \qquad \forall p_0 > 1, \lambda > 0.$$

By $(3b)$, there exists positive $\bar{T}$ such that $\kappa(\lambda, p) \le \varepsilon/2$ holds for all positive $\lambda < 1/\bar{T}$.

By the definitions of the subsolution and the supersolution, there exists positive $\hat{T} > \bar{T}$ such that, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\lambda \in (0, 1/\hat{T})$ and natural $h > \hat{T}, T > h + \hat{T}$, one has

$$U_\lambda(\omega) \le \left[\lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt + e^{-\lambda h} U_\lambda(z(h)) + \varepsilon/2\right]_\omega, \tag{16}$$

$$V[v_T](\omega) \ge \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \frac{T-h}{T} V[v_{T-h}](z(h)) - \varepsilon/3\right]_\omega. \tag{17}$$

Note that, for all $\lambda \in (0, 1/\hat{T})$, U_λ is bounded; then, $e^{-\lambda h_0} U_\lambda < \varepsilon/2$ for all sufficiently large natural h_0. Now, (16), (2c), and $g \le 1$ imply that $U_\lambda(\omega) \le \lambda \int_0^h e^{-\lambda t}\, dt + \varepsilon \le 2$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1/\hat{T})$.

The special choice of T. Fix every natural $T > kp^{n+1}\hat{T} > kp^{n+1}\bar{T}$ such that $T(k+1)^{-n-1}$ is also natural. Then, $T(1-p^{-1})p^{-n} = Tk^n(k+1)^{-n-1}$ is natural as well. Set

$$h \triangleq T(1-p^{-1}) = \frac{T}{k+1}, \quad q \triangleq p^{-1}, \quad \lambda \triangleq \frac{p \ln p}{T(p-1)} = \frac{\ln p}{h}.$$

In view of $p \ln p > p - 1 > \ln p$, we also have

$$\frac{p}{\lambda} > \frac{p \ln p}{\lambda(p-1)} = T > \frac{1}{\lambda} > \frac{\ln p}{\lambda(p-1)} = \frac{T}{p} = \frac{h(k+1)}{p} = \frac{h}{p-1} = kh > kp^n\hat{T},$$

$$p/\lambda > T > 1/\lambda > T - h = kh > h > \hat{T}p^n > \bar{T}p^n, \quad e^{-\lambda h} = p^{-1} = q = \frac{T-h}{T} = \frac{k}{k+1}. \tag{18}$$

For all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, the numbers $hq^i, (T-h)q^i = khq^i$ are natural; now, from $(T-h)q^i > hq^i > \hat{T}$ and $\lambda p^i < 1/\bar{T}$ it follows that $\lambda p^i, hq^i, Tq^i$ satisfy the inequalities (16), (17) for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Moreover, $U_{p^{i+1}\lambda} \le 2$ holds for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$.

Forward-tracking. By $\lambda < 1/\hat{T} < 1/\bar{T}$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) &\overset{(16)}{\le} \left[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + e^{-\lambda h} U_\lambda(z(h)) + \varepsilon/2\right]_\omega \\ &\le \left[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + q U_{p\lambda}(z(h)) + \varepsilon/2 + \kappa(\lambda, p)\right]_\omega \\ &\le \left[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + q U_{p\lambda}(z(h))\right]_\omega + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, by $p\lambda < 1/\hat{T} < 1/\bar{T}$ and $e^{-p\lambda qh} = e^{-\lambda h} = q$, for all $z \in \mathbb{K}$,

$$\begin{aligned} qU_{p\lambda}(z(h)) &\le q\left[\int_0^{qh} p\lambda e^{-p\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt + e^{-p\lambda qh} U_{p^2\lambda}(z_1(qh))\right]_{z(h)} + q\varepsilon/2 + q\kappa(p\lambda, p) \\ &= \left[\int_0^{qh} \lambda e^{-p\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt + q^2 U_{p^2\lambda}(z_1(qh))\right]_{z(h)} + q\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting it into the relation above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) &\le \left[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + q U_{p\lambda}(z(h))\right]_\omega + \varepsilon \\ &\le \left[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + \Big[\int_0^{qh} \lambda e^{-p\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt + q^2 U_{p^2\lambda}(z_1(qh))\Big]_{z(h)}\right]_\omega + \varepsilon(1+q). \end{aligned}$$

Repeating, by $\lambda p^2 < 1/\hat{T} < 1/\bar{T}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) \le \Bigg[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\, dt + \Big[\int_0^{qh} \lambda e^{-p\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\, dt \\ + \Big[\int_0^{q^2 h} \lambda e^{-p^2\lambda t} g(z_2(t))\, dt + q^3 U_{p^2\lambda}(z_2(q^2 h))\Big]_{z_1(qh)}\Big]_{z(h)}\Bigg]_\omega + \varepsilon(1+q+q^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in a similar way, in view of $\lambda p^n < 1/\hat{T} < 1/\bar{T}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) \;\le\; & \Bigg[\int_0^h \lambda e^{-\lambda t} g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\int_0^{qh} \lambda e^{-p\lambda t} g(z_1(t))\,dt \\ & + \Big[\int_0^{q^2 h} \lambda e^{-p^2\lambda t} g(z_2(t))\,dt + \cdots + \Big[\int_0^{q^n h} \lambda e^{-p^n\lambda t} g(z_n(t))\,dt \\ & + q^{n+1} U_{p^{n+1}\lambda}(z_n(q^n h)) \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(qh)} \Bigg]_{z(h)} \Bigg]_\omega + \varepsilon(1+q+q^2+\cdots+q^n). \end{aligned}$$

Backtracking. Note that $U_{p^{n+1}\lambda} \le 2, g \ge 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) \;\le\; & \Bigg[\int_0^h \lambda g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\int_0^{qh} \lambda g(z_1(t))\,dt + \Big[\int_0^{q^2 h} \lambda g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + \Big[\int_0^{q^n h} \lambda g(z_n(t))\,dt \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_1(qh)} \Bigg]_{z(h)} \Bigg]_\omega + 2q^{n+1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-q}. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of n and p, we have $2q^{n+1} < \varepsilon^{1/2}$ and $\frac{\varepsilon}{1-q} = \frac{p\varepsilon}{p-1} \le 2\varepsilon^{1/2}$. By (18), $\lambda < p/T$ holds. Thanks to $V[v_{q^n(T-h)}] \ge 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) \;\le\; & \Bigg[\int_0^h \lambda g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\int_0^{qh} \lambda g(z_1(t))\,dt + \Big[\int_0^{q^2 h} \lambda g(z_2(t))\,dt \\ & + \cdots + \Big[\int_0^{q^n h} \lambda g(z_n(t))\,dt \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \cdots \Big]_{z_2(q^2 h)} \Bigg]_{z_1(qh)} \Bigg]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ \overset{(2c)}{\le} \; & \Bigg[\frac{p}{T} \int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{p}{T} \int_0^{qh} g(z_1(t))\,dt + \cdots + \Big[\frac{p}{T} \int_0^{q^n h} g(z_n(t))\,dt \\ & + q^n V[v_{q^n(T-h)}](z_n(q^n h)) \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \cdots \Big]_{z(h)} \Bigg]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ \overset{(2b)}{=} \; & p \Bigg[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Big[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^{qh} g(z_1(t))\,dt + \cdots + \Big[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^{q^n h} g(z_n(t))\,dt \\ & + q^{n+1} V[v_{q^n(T-h)}](z_n(q^n h)) \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \cdots \Big]_{z(h)} \Bigg]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $q^n T = q^{n-1}(T-h) > \hat{T}$, $q = \frac{q^n T - q^n h}{q^n T}$ (see (18)); also, (17) holds for $q^n h, q^n T$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Big[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^{q^n h} g(z_n(t))\,dt + q^{n+1} V[v_{q^n(T-h)}](z_n(q^n h)) \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \\ = \; & q^n \Big[\frac{1}{q^n T} \int_0^{q^n h} g(z_n(t))\,dt + q V[v_{q^n(T-h)}](z_n(q^n h)) \Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \\ \overset{(17)}{\le} \; & q^n V[v_{q^n T}](z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)) + q^n \varepsilon/3 \\ \overset{(18)}{=} \; & q^n V[v_{q^{n-1}(T-h)}](z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)) + q^n \varepsilon/3. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$U_\lambda(\omega) \;\le\; p\Bigg[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + \Bigg[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^{qh} g(z_1(t))\,dt + \cdots + \Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^{q^{n-1}h} g(z_{n-1}(t))\,dt \\ +q^n V[v_{q^{n-1}(T-h)}](z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h))\Big]_{z_{n-1}(q^{n-1}h)} \dots \Bigg]_{z(h)}\Bigg]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} + pq^n\varepsilon/3.$$

Proceeding in a similar way, since $q^{i-1}(T-h) \overset{(18)}{=} q^i T$ holds for all $i \in \{0,1,2,\dots,n\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\omega) &\le p\Big[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^h g(z(t))\,dt + qV[v_{T-h}](z(h))\Big]_\omega + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} + p(q^n+\cdots+q)\varepsilon/3 \\ &\le pV[v_T](\omega) + 3\varepsilon^{1/2} + p(q^n+\cdots+q+1)\varepsilon/3 \\ &\le p-1+V[v_T](\omega) + 5\varepsilon^{1/2} \\ &\le V[v_T](\omega) + 7\varepsilon^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

By (18) and $T > \bar{T}$, we get $\kappa(1/T, \frac{p\ln p}{p-1}) \overset{(18)}{=} \kappa(1/T, T\lambda) \le \kappa(1/T, p) \le \varepsilon/2$. Hence,

$$U_{1/T} \le U_\lambda + \varepsilon/2 \le V[v_T] + 7\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon/2 \tag{19}$$

for all positive $T > kp^{n+1}\hat{T}$ if $T/(k+1)^{n+1}$ is also a natural number.

The general case. Consider every positive $T' > k\max\big(p^{n+2}\hat{T}, (k+1)^{n+1}\big)$. Now, we can choose a positive $r > 1$ such that $\frac{T'}{r(k+1)^{n+1}}$ is natural and $0 \le T' - \frac{T'}{r} \le (k+1)^{n+1}$ holds. By the choice of $\hat{T}$ and T', we also obtain

$$1 \le r \le \left(1 - \frac{(k+1)^{n+1}}{T'}\right)^{-1} \le 1 + \frac{(k+1)^{n+1}}{T'} < 1 + \frac{1}{k} = p.$$

Now, it follows from $T'/r \ge T'/p \ge kp^{n+1}\hat{T} \ge \bar{T}$ that, first, by the definition of κ,

$$U_{1/T'} - U_{r/T'} \le \kappa(r/T', r) \le \kappa(r/T', p) \le \varepsilon/2,$$

secondly, (19) holds for $T = T'/r$. At last, thanks to (8a), we also obtain

$$V[v_{T'/r}] \le V[v_{T'}] + 2(r-1) \le V[v_{T'}] + 2(p-1) \le V[v_{T'}] + \varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Thus,

$$U_{1/T'} \le U_{r/T'} + \varepsilon/2 \overset{(19)}{\le} V[v_{T'/r}] + 7\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon \le V[v_{T'}] + 8\varepsilon^{1/2} + \varepsilon \le V[v_{T'}] + 9\varepsilon^{1/2}$$

for all sufficiently large positive T'. By arbitrariness of positive ε, the proof is complete. □